

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR /	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
CONTROL NO.		PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER

20070228

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The previous action directed toward a restriction requirement mailed 6/22/06, has been withdrawn in light of an oral election. See attached interview summary. An action on the merits will be forthcoming.

28 FMOL

J	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/790,638	WERNER ET AL.
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kara E. Geisel	2877
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Kara E. Geisel</u> .	(3)	
(2) Bruce Cottrell, attorney of record.	(4)	·
Date of Interview: <u>6 February 2007</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None.		
Claims discussed: 1-15		
Prior art documents discussed: None.		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
	•	
laca Gerrol	Super Harry Pate	elley, Jr. n Examiner 12 FCB 07
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Si	gnature - if appropriate)

Application No. 10/790,638

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: An election restriction requirement was sent out by the Office on 22 June 2006. The requirement came back as undeliverable. The examiner called the attorney confirming the address, and from the discussion, it appears that the mailing address was correct. Normally the restriction would be remailed, but the attorney chose to elect Group I, claims 1-7, with traverse, over the phone. So the previous action will be withdrawn and a new first action will be mailed out once the case has been searched.